

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)
		TSW-32978
<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]</p> <p>on _____</p> <p>Signature_____</p> <p>Typed or printed name _____</p>		
<p>Application Number</p> <p>09/664,273</p> <p>First Named Inventor</p> <p>Jean-Claude Constantin</p> <p>Art Unit</p> <p>2614</p>		<p>Filed</p> <p>September 18, 2000</p> <p>Examiner</p> <p>Lun-See Lao</p>

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant/inventor.

assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

attorney or agent of record. 44682
Registration number _____.

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____.

/Aaron A. Fishman/

Signature

Aaron A. Fishman

Typed or printed name

216-579-1700

Telephone number

February 23, 2009

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Jean-Claude Constantin
Appln. No. : 09/664,273
Filed : September 18, 2000

Title : METHOD FOR CONTROLLING A TRANSMISSION SYSTEM,
APPLICATION OF THE METHOD, A TRANSMISSION SYSTEM,
A RECEIVER AND A HEARING AID

Conf. No. : 4537
TC/A.U. : 2614

Examiner : Lun-See Lao
Customer No. : 00116
Docket No. : TSW-32978

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Sir:

Applicants request a pre-appeal brief conference for review of the final rejection in the above-identified application.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary of the Invention

According to an aspect of the present invention, a simple mechanism is provided by which an FM receiver attached to a hearing device for receiving the RF signal from a remote wireless microphone can automatically be set to operate on the carrier frequency of the desired RF signal in a multifrequency FM system. In other words, it solves the problem of achieving automatic transmitter-receiver frequency pairing without user intervention. The disclosed solution to this configuration problem is to provide an auxiliary digital data channel (e.g. *control channel* 110, 111, 112, 113) along side (i.e. concurrent to and separate from) the existing primary communication channel (i.e. *information channel* 120) via which the analog FM signal is being transmitted. It is important to note that the transmission parameters (e.g. the carrier frequency) of the *control channel* would need to be fixed/predefined (i.e. selected at the time when the *transmission system* is initially set up) within a specific *transmission system* (i.e. for a certain group of users), in order to ensure that the configuration data (e.g. the transmission parameters of the *information channel*) transmitted by any device (Sl...Sn, 102, 105, 107) chosen to send such configuration data can be received by any device (i.e. *receiver* 1) intended to receive such configuration data independent of the

changeable/configurable (i.e. based on the configuration data received during operation of the *transmission system*) transmission parameters used for the *information channel*.

Claim Rejections

For the following reasons, claims 21 and 31 were improperly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,783 to Anderson (hereinafter "Anderson"). The rejection of claims 21 and 31 can be found on pages 5 to 7 of the final Office action dated August 21, 2008 (hereinafter "the Office action"). Further support for the rejection was provided in the Advisory action dated February 2, 2009 (hereinafter "the Advisory action").

In the Office action, the Examiner cites Anderson for teaching and/or rendering obvious all of the limitations of claims 21 and 31. By contrast to the system of the presently claimed invention, which transmits a plurality of audio signals to multiple hearing devices, Anderson relates to a hearing aid system in which bi-directional wireless transmissions occur between components of an individual user's hearing aid system. Even when this hearing aid system is used in a multi-user environment, Anderson does not contemplate a single transmitting means that transmits a plurality of audio signals to a plurality of hearing devices. As described in more detail below, several of the limitations of claims 21 and 31 are completely absent from the teachings of the prior art as cited by the Examiner.

FIRST: Claims 21 and 31 require a means for transmitting a *plurality* of audio signals to a *plurality* of hearing devices. The Examiner correctly cites Fig. 2 as disclosing a hearing device. Fig. 2 is a block diagram of a two-piece hearing aid, consisting of an earpiece (22) and a remote processor unit (RPU) (23). Further, the Examiner cites Fig. 9 as disclosing a means for transmitting a *plurality* of audio signals to the hearing device. This interpretation of Fig. 9 is incorrect. Fig. 9 is a block diagram of the RPU, which is merely a component of the hearing aid shown in Fig. 2 of Anderson. Fig. 9 does not show a means for transmitting a *plurality* of audio signals. The examiner may have been misled by the fact that three antennas (900, 960, 970) are illustrated. The purpose of these three antennas (900, 960, 970) is not to transmit multiple signals but rather, as explained in col. 8, lines 53-67, to provide various antenna orientations, allowing the digital signal processor (DSP) to automatically select the antenna that yields the best link reliability.

Further, in the Advisory action the Examiner states, with reference to col. 8, line 53 - col. 9, line 35, that "Anderson teaches a means for transmitting a plurality of audio signals to a plurality of hearing devices in that the three antennas 900, 960, 970 (fig. 9) transmit a plurality of audio signals to a plurality of hearing devices (cell phones) at different frequencies." This is incorrect. Nowhere in Anderson is it

stated that all three antennas are used for transmitting a plurality of signals simultaneously, nor that each antenna transmits at a different frequency. Furthermore, the arrangement according to Fig. 9 cannot concurrently produce three different RF signals at three different frequencies nor could it provide such three different RF signals to the individual antennas. As mentioned above, the three antenna configuration depicted in Fig. 9 enables the use of diversity switching (in order to improve reception quality by selecting the antenna with the strongest signal), which makes it clear that the RF circuitry is connected to only a single antenna at any time.

Thus, the Examiner has clearly erred in stating that Anderson teaches means for transmitting a plurality of audio signals to the hearing devices, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

SECOND: Claims 21 and 31 further require a means for *remotely generating and wirelessly transmitting* configuration parameters to the hearing devices and each hearing device further comprising means for receiving the configuration parameters. The Examiner cites the DSP (948) in Fig. 9 as the means for *remotely generating and wirelessly transmitting* the configuration parameters. The Examiner then cites the very same DSP (948) as the means in each hearing aid for receiving the configuration parameters (that were remotely generated and wirelessly transmitted). It is clearly improper to characterize the DSP (948) both as means for “remotely generating and wirelessly transmitting configuration parameters” and as means for “receiving the configuration parameters” from itself. Such an application of Anderson’s teachings to claims 21 and 31 would be inconsistent with any reasonable interpretation of the meaning of the limitations “*remotely generating*” and “*wirelessly transmitting*.” That is, even if the DSP (948) could somehow be interpreted as receiving configuration parameters that are also generated by the DSP (948), the generation of the configuration parameters is clearly not done “*remotely*” and they are clearly not being transmitted “*wirelessly*” as required by the claim.

Thus, the Examiner has clearly erred in stating that Anderson teaches means for remotely generating and wirelessly transmitting configuration parameters, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

THIRD: Claims 21 and 31 further require that each hearing device comprises means for tuning the means for receiving of at least one of the plurality of audio signals to an audio signal according to the configuration parameters. The Examiner cites three RF switches (962, 904, 902) in Fig. 9 of Anderson. These RF switches are used to select the antenna that yields the best link reliability as briefly described above (see col. 8, lines 53-67 of Anderson). The RF switches have nothing to do with tuning a receiving means to an audio signal, as in claims 21 and 31.

Further, although the DSP controls the RPU transceiver in order to switch between different modes of operation (e.g. transmit or receive) Anderson in fact teaches using “operating frequencies ... chosen ... in advance of operation” (col. 6, lines 35-41), i.e. using predefined carrier frequencies. Accordingly, Anderson clearly teaches away from tuning a receiving means according to *received* configuration parameters, as required by claims 21 and 31, since its receiving means would be pre-tuned.

Thus, the Examiner has clearly erred in stating that Anderson teaches means for tuning the means for receiving of at least one of the plurality of audio signals to an audio signal according to the configuration parameters, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the above-described reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21 and 31 and their respective dependent claims were improperly rejected and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. TSW-32978.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/
Aaron A. Fishman – Reg. No. 44,682

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

February 23, 2009

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)
		TSW-32978
<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]</p> <p>on _____</p> <p>Signature_____</p> <p>Typed or printed name _____</p>		
<p>Application Number</p> <p>09/664,273</p>		<p>Filed</p> <p>September 18, 2000</p>
<p>First Named Inventor</p> <p>Jean-Claude Constantin</p>		
<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2614</p>	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Lun-See Lao</p>	

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant/inventor.

assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

attorney or agent of record. 44682
Registration number _____.

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____.

/Aaron A. Fishman/

Signature

Aaron A. Fishman

Typed or printed name

216-579-1700

Telephone number

February 23, 2009

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

<input type="checkbox"/>	*Total of _____ forms are submitted.
--------------------------	--------------------------------------

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.